

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of June 18, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. Nonetheless, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-7 and 9-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,173,250 to Jong (hereinafter Jong) in view of U.S. Patent 6,816,578 to Kredo, *et al.* (hereinafter Kredo), and in further view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0049389 to Marko, *et al.* (hereinafter Marko). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jong, in view of Kredo and Marko, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,339,754 to Flanagan, *et al.* (hereinafter Flanagan).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 5, and 9-10. Applicants have cancelled Claims 11-21. However, Applicants are not conceding that the remaining claims as originally formulated or the cancelled claims fail to present patentable subject matter. The amendments and cancellations are solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution. Accordingly, neither the amendments nor cancellations should be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter, and Applicants expressly reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is a method of reducing bandwidth requirements in an on-line chat system.

The method can include receiving a speech input from a calling party; transcribing the speech input to a text message in a same language as the speech input; and converting the text message to an alternative text message in a same language as the received text message based upon at least one of a calling party profile and a called party profile. The calling party profile or the called party profile can specify replacing at least a portion of the text message with an alternative text portion having a same meaning as the replaced portion of the text message. The alternative text portion has a shorter length than the replaced portion of the text message.

The method also can include performing data compression to compress the alternative text message prior to transmitting the alternative text message as a data stream defining a text stream; transmitting the text stream to the called party; receiving the alternative text message by the called party as the text stream; and displaying the alternative text message and/or converting the alternative text message into a speech output at the called party substantially in real-time.

See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0021]; see also Fig. 2.

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

One aspect of the method of the present invention is a significant reduction in the bandwidth requirement in an on-line chat system by (1) using voice-to-text compression, (2) converting the text message to a shorter text message, and (3) further compressing the

shorter text message prior to transmission. The compressed, shorter text message received at the receiving party can then be displayed and/or converted to a voice output.

Jong discloses converting speech input signals into text data through the use of speech recognition. However, Jong does not disclose converting the text message to a shorter text message or further compressing the shorter text message prior to transmission.

Kredo discloses in col. 8, lines 18-25 that the IM proxy server 26 can convert text into an appropriate short hand representation as illustrated in steps 234 and 236 and translate these short hand representations into corresponding words, phrases, or sounds as illustrated in the translation of the text message in step 230 to the speech of step 232 (see Fig. 3D).

However, it is noted that in the present invention, the received shorter text message is not translated into a speech that corresponds to the original text message. Rather, the received shorter text message will be rendered as it is, namely converted to a voice output based on the shorter text message itself (see Fig. 2). For example, as shown in Fig. 2 of the instant application, the shorter text message "Wassup?" is converted to a voice output as "Wassup?", not as "What's going on?" that corresponds to the original text message. Therefore, the receiving party will hear "Wassup?", not "What's going on?".

Marko discloses compressing a text prior to transmitting the text over a radio channel. It is noted that Marko concerns a radio communication system, not an on-line chat system as in the present invention. Therefore, Marko does not concern the same problem as the present invention and is drawn from a field different from Applicants' invention. It is noted that Applicants do not claim to have invented compressing a text prior to transmission. Rather, the novel aspect of the present invention is a combination of conversion of a speech input to a text, conversion of the text to a shorter text, and

compression of the converted shorter text prior to transmission in order to reduce the bandwidth requirements in on-line chat systems.

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claim 1, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 defines over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: July 30, 2008

/Richard A. Hinson/
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000